Appeal: 08-1671 Doc: 24 Filed: 03/16/2009 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1671

LAUNEIL SANDERS; JANNETH SANDERS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

HENRY MCMASTER, State of South Carolina Authorized Agent, Chief Law Enforcement Officer, SC Attorney General; TREY GOWDY, State of South Carolina, SC 7th Solicitor; MARK KITCHENS; DAVID INGALLS; DAVID ALFORD; PREPAID LEGAL, INC., Its Authorized Representative Counsel Berry, Quackenbush, and Stuart,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Spartanburg. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., Senior District Judge. (7:07-cv-03510-GRA-WMC)

Submitted: March 12, 2009 Decided: March 16, 2009

Before MOTZ and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Launeil Sanders, Janneth Sanders, Appellants Pro Se. Mary Frances G. Jowers, SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE, Columbia, South Carolina; Edwin Calhoun Haskell, III, SMITH & HASKELL, Spartanburg, South Carolina; Christopher R. Antley,

Appeal: 08-1671 Doc: 24 Filed: 03/16/2009 Pg: 2 of 3

DEVLIN & PARKINSON, PA, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellees; David Griffith Ingalls, Appellee Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 08-1671 Doc: 24 Filed: 03/16/2009 Pg: 3 of 3

PER CURIAM:

Launeil Sanders and Janneth Sanders appeal district court's order accepting the recommendation of magistrate judge and granting the motions to dismiss filed by Defendants, David Alford, Henry McMaster, and the State of South Carolina. In their informal appellate brief, the Sanders failed to challenge the district court's reasons supporting the denial of relief. Accordingly, the Sanders have forfeited appellate review of those issues. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) ("The Court will limit its review to the issues raised in the informal brief."). Accordingly, we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis and affirm the district court's order. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED